Remarks

In the Office Action mailed on 24 July 2007, the Examiner rejected all claims (1-25) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over McIntyre (United States Patent Number 6,690,478) in view of Wood (United States Patent Publication Number 2004/0243934).

Applicants traverse the rejection and request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 for editorial clarity and to better protect the invention.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected all claims (1-25) under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over McIntyre in view of Wood. Applicants traverse the rejection.

The Examiner suggests that McIntyre teaches processing a plurality of jobs as step (b) of claim 1 (processing a plurality of work units where a work unit is read as a print job). The Examiner suggests that each of McIntyre's jobs is processed by one of a selected plurality of page description language (PDL) processing elements. Each PDL transforms its job from a first format (the PDL commands/data) to a second format (a low level, printer specific format). The Examiner then notes that McIntyre fails to teach step (a) of claim 1 – parsing a datastream into a plurality of work units. The Examiner suggests such a feature is well known and cites portions of Wood in support thereof.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that a "work unit" as defined in the subject application is a unit of work ***that may be processed independent of the other "work units"***. (See, e.g., page 6, line 23 through page 7, line 2). Further, as used in the subject application, the plurality of work units could be parsed from multiple "jobs" (as the term "jobs" is used by the Examiner in the references) or may be parsed from a single print job. Thus the "work units" of the subject application may be derived from the same print job but are none the less capable of being processed independent of one another. Further, the claimed methods and systems are adapted to process multiple of the work units in parallel.

Neither McIntyre nor Wood (individually or in combination) teach or reasonably suggest that each "work unit" is independent of the others and that the work units may be

parsed from a single print job. Further, neither McIntyre nor Wood (individually or in combination) teach or reasonably suggest that the "work units" may be processed in parallel and independent of one another. In particular, McIntyre does not address any parallel processing of multiple work units that may be derived (parsed) from a single "job". Rather, McIntyre teaches only that a job is processed by a selected one of a plurality of PDL processing elements. Wood, suggests parallel processing of his "work units" (segments) is anything but independent of the other work units. Rather, each processor must process the "global segments". (See, e.g., paragraph 0034 " That is, before a PDL processor may process a specific segment data file (e.g., segment file 22_K), the processor must first process either the global data files 20 or segment data files 22 for all previous segments (i.e., global data files 20_1, 20_2, . . . , 20_{K-1} or segment data files 22_1, 22_2, . . . , 22_{K-1})"). Thus none of the art of record, considered individually or in any combination teaches or reasonably suggests the features of rejected claim 1 reciting parallel processing of multiple work units parsed from a single job where processing of each work unit is independent of processing of all other work units.

Independent claims 10 and 19 were rejected for similar reasons to claim 1 and have been similarly amended to clarify the understanding of a "work unit" and the independent, parallel processing of the plurality of work units.

In view of the above discussion and the clarifying amendments, Applicants maintain that claims 1, 10, and 19 are allowable over all art of record. Dependent claims 2-8, 11-18, and 20-25 recite additional limitations and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 10, and 19 from which they depend and as dependent upon allowable base claims.

In view of the above discussion and the various amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection.

Conclusion

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 for editorial clarity to better protect the invention. Applicants have traversed and thoroughly discussed the Examiner's rejections of all claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and objections.

Applicant believes that no other fees are due in this matter. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel N. Fishman/

Daniel N. Fishman #35,512
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)